

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by Eibergen et al. (International Publication WO 01/39937) (hereinafter “Eibergen”). (See 10/1/08 Office Action, p. 2).

Claim 1 recites “[a] shaving head comprising at least two blade-shaped cutting members each having a straight cutting edge extending parallel to a longitudinal direction of the shaving head, each cutting member being supported in a cartridge of the shaving head by a supporting member supporting the respective cutting member in a supported area on the respective cutting member, said supported area extending over a predetermined distance perpendicular to the longitudinal direction, and each supporting member having a first portion in contact with said supported area remote from the cutting edge of the respective cutting member and a second portion in contact with said supported area near the cutting edge of the respective cutting member, *said first portion having a uniform cross-sectional area, seen perpendicularly to the longitudinal direction, and said second portion having a reduced cross-sectional area compared to the uniform cross-sectional area of the first portion, wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members extends over at least half of said predetermined distance.*”

The Examiner asserts that Eibergen discloses the uniform cross-sectional area of the first portion of the supporting member. In support of this rejection, the Examiner provides a modified version of Figure 2 indicating the location of the supporting area

(See 10/1/08 Office Action, p. 3). The Examiner also states that “Eibergen does teach a rectangular cross section, ‘t’.” (*Id.*, p. 4). The Examiner indicates this “uniform cross-section t” in the modified drawing at the transition of portion 1 to portion 2 (according to the modified figure). However, Applicants note that this “uniform cross-section t” does not meet the recited “said first portion having a uniform cross-sectional area.” It is clear, from the modified figure provided by the Examiner, that the 1st portion does not have a uniform cross section. The cross section of the first portion at different locations will be different and therefore, cannot be “uniform.”

Furthermore, neither Figure 2 of Eibergen nor the modified figure provided by the Examiner shows “the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members extends over at least half of said predetermined distance,” as recited in claim 1. The predetermined distance is recited in the claim as a “supported area extending over a predetermined distance perpendicular to the longitudinal direction.” The modified figure provided by the Examiner clearly shows that the second portion defined by the Examiner does not “extend[] over at least half of said predetermined distance.”

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Eibergen. Because claims 2, 4, and 6 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eibergen as applied to claim 1 above, in view of U.S. Patent 5,822,862 to Ferraro (hereinafter “Ferraro”). (See 10/1/08 Office Action, p. 3-4).

Applicants respectfully submit that Ferraro does not disclose a supporting member with a first portion and a second portion as recited in claim 1, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Eibergen described above with reference to claim 1. Because

claims 3 and 5 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 17, 2008

By: 
Michael J. Marcini (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcini, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276